

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE DISTRICT OF NEBRASKA

EDGAR BRAVO GONZALEZ,

8:12CV444

Plaintiff,

v.

**MEMORANDUM  
AND ORDER**

UNITED STATES DRUG  
ENFORCEMENT  
ADMINISTRATION,

Defendant.

This matter is before the court on its own motion. On December 26, 2012, Plaintiff filed his Complaint in this matter along with a Motion for Leave to Proceed in Forma Pauperis (“IFP”). (Filing Nos. [1](#) and [2](#).) On February 20, 2013, the court granted Plaintiff’s IFP Motion and assessed an initial partial filing fee pursuant to [28 U.S.C. § 1915\(b\)\(1\)](#). (Filing No. [6](#).) In doing so, the court warned Plaintiff that his case would be dismissed if he failed to pay the initial partial filing fee by March 20, 2013. (*Id.*)

The March 20, 2013, deadline has passed and Plaintiff has not paid the initial partial filing fee in this matter or asked for an extension of time in which to do so. (See Docket Sheet.) Therefore, Plaintiff’s case is dismissed for failing to comply with the court’s February 20, 2013, Memorandum and Order. See [Fed. R. Civ. Pro. 41\(b\)](#); see also [Conley v. Holden, No. 03-3908, 2004 WL 2202452, at \\*1 \(8th Cir. Sept. 21, 2004\)](#) (affirming district court’s dismissal of inmate’s case for failing to pay the assessed initial partial filing fee).

IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED that:

1. Plaintiff's Complaint (Filing No. [1](#)) is dismissed without prejudice because Plaintiff failed to comply with this court's orders.

2. A separate judgment will be entered in accordance with this Memorandum and Order.

DATED this 5th day of April, 2013.

BY THE COURT:

*s/ John M. Gerrard*  
United States District Judge

---

\*This opinion may contain hyperlinks to other documents or Web sites. The U.S. District Court for the District of Nebraska does not endorse, recommend, approve, or guarantee any third parties or the services or products they provide on their Web sites. Likewise, the court has no agreements with any of these third parties or their Web sites. The court accepts no responsibility for the availability or functionality of any hyperlink. Thus, the fact that a hyperlink ceases to work or directs the user to some other site does not affect the opinion of the court.